FILE COPY

Office Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 3 1951
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

TERM No. 201

No. 621

KECO INDUSTRIES, INC., a Corporation Organized and Existing under the Laws of the State of Ohio, 2438 Beekman Street, Cincinnati 14, Ohio,

Petitioner,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

PAUL W. STEER,
2215 Union Central Building,
Cincinnati 2, Ohio,
Counsel for Petitioner.

THE JOHNSON & HARDIN CO., LAW PRINTERS
CINCINNATI, OHIO

INDEX

	PAGE
Opinion Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Question Presented	2
Statute Involved	2
Statement of the Case	2
Reasons for Granting the Writ	4
1. Since the Administrative Discretion of the Contracting Officer Was Exhausted, Petitioner Held Legal Rights, from Whose Invasion It May Appeal.	4
2. Decisions of the Comptroller General Are Reviewable.	7
3. It Is to the Benefit of the Government That Bidders on Public Contracts Not Be Prejudiced by Erroneous Determinations of Law.	8
4. The Comptroller General's Decision Was Patently Erroneous.	9
Conclusion	10
Appendix A—Statute	11
Appendix B—Opinion and Judgment Below	12

CITATIONS

Cases:

Heyer Products Company, Inc. v. *The United States*, 135 Ct. Cl. 63	4, 6
Miguel v. *McCarl*, 291 U. S. 442	7
Perkins v. *Lukens Steel*, 310 U. S. 113	8
The United States v. *Purcell Envelope Company*, 249 U. S. 313	4, 5, 6, 8

Statutes:

	PAGE
5 U. S. C. 1009	8
10 U. S. C. 2305	2, 5
28 U. S. C. 1255	2
28 U. S. C. 1491	2
41 U. S. C. 322	8

Miscellaneous:

Armed Services Procurement Regulations Section 2-407.9 7

Jaffee, The Right to Judicial Review, 71 Harvard Law Review 401 7

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

TERM No. 201

No. ———

KECO INDUSTRIES, INC., a Corporation Organized and Existing under the Laws of the State of Ohio, 2438 Beekman Street, Cincinnati 14, Ohio,

Petitioner,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Petitioner prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Claims entered in the above entitled case on March 8, 1960, and its order of October 5, 1960, overruling plaintiff's motion for a rehearing.

OPINION BELOW

The memorandum opinion of the Court of Claims is unreported and is printed in Appendix B hereto (p. 12).

JURISDICTION

The Judgment of the United States Court of Claims was entered on March 18, 1960. Plaintiff was granted 180 days additional time in which to file its motion for a re-hearing. A motion for a re-hearing was filed by plaintiff on September 13, 1960, which motion was overruled by the Court of Claims on October 5, 1960. The Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. 1255.

The Court of Claims had jurisdiction under 28 U. S. C. 1491.

QUESTION PRESENTED

Has a low bidder for a government contract regarding whose bid an award has been recommended by the Contracting Officer, whose bid has been determined by the Contracting Officer to be the lowest and the best bid and whose bid has been determined by the Contracting Officer to comply with the terms of the invitation to bid, a legal right to recover expenses incurred in the preparation of its bid, when its bid is subsequently discarded as the result of a decision by the Comptroller General which decision is erroneous in law and which decision amounts to an arbitrary and illegal act?

STATUTE INVOLVED

The statute involved is 10 U. S. C. Section 2305. It is printed in Appendix A (p. 11).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Keco Industries, Inc., Petitioner, herein, was the low bidder among 15 bids submitted in response to an invitation for bids for certain air conditioners issued by the Contracting Officer, Gadsden Air Force Base, Alabama.

Paragraph X-2 of the Invitation for Bids (Exhibit 2, transcript) provided:

> "Failure of a bidder to have furnished descriptive literature will result in rejection of that bid. However, *the bid will not be rejected if the bidder has previously offered a product which has been previously procured so that additional descriptive literature could not add to the Government's knowledge of the acceptability of the product.* The Contracting Officer will verify that the product previously procured is adequate to meet the requirements of this Invitation for Bids. Upon verification, the requirements for furnishing descriptive literature may be waived as to that bidder." (Emphasis supplied.)

On January 29, 1958, in accordance with said Section X-2 the Contracting Officer wrote to Keco Industries in part as follows (Exhibit 10, transcript):

> "It has now been determined to waive the descriptive literature requirement to your company pursuant to the rights reserved by the Government under provision X-2 of this Invitation to Bid . . . Action is being taken this date to recommend award to your company. . . ."

Subsequently as a result of protests of unsuccessful bidders and in accordance with Armed Services Procurement Regulations 2-407.9, the question was submitted to the Comptroller General as to whether the Contracting Officer had the right to award the contract to Keco under the circumstances. On March 31, 1958 (Exhibit 13, transcript) and again on May 15, 1958 (Exhibit 14, transcript) the Comptroller General ruled that the Contracting Officer had no legal right to accept Keco's bid. Submitting to this ruling, the contract was entered into with another and higher bidder.

Keco Industries, Inc., Petitioner herein, thereafter on September 15, 1958, filed its petition in the United States Court of Claims, alleging the foregoing facts and, in addition, alleging (a) that the above ruling of the Comptroller

General was "in law erroneous, illegal, and so arbitrary as to amount to capriciousness on his part" and (b) that petitioner had expended $44,940.00 in the preparation of its bid and in rendering assistance to the Air Force in evaluation of the bid.

Respondent filed a motion for summary judgment based on the petition and the documents contained in the transcript. The Court of Claims sustained this motion on the sole authority of its decision in *Heyer Products Company, Inc.* v. *The United States*, 135 Ct. Cl. 63, but made no finding as to the correctness of the Comptroller General's determination. Petitioner's motion for a re-hearing was overruled.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

1. Since the Administrative Discretion of the Contracting Officer Was Exhausted, Petitioner Held Legal Rights, from Whose Invasion It May Appeal.

The Court of Claims decision is directly contrary to the decision and philosophy expressed by this Court in *The United States* v. *Purcell Envelope Company*, 249 U. S. 313. In that case, this Court held that when the administrative discretion of a government contracting officer has been exhausted (in that case by the making of an award to the low bidder) rights accrue to the bidder in whose favor the discretion has been exercised and obligations are incurred by the government.

Respondent attempted in the Court of Claims to distinguish the *Purcell Envelope* case on the grounds that an award (though no contract) had been made in that case, whereas in the instant case, the Contracting Officer had "merely" decided to "recommend award" to Petitioner (Exhibit 10, transcript).

In *Purcell Envelope* this Court stated at page 318:

> "There must be a point of time at which discretion is exhausted. The procedure for the advertising for bids for supplies or services to the Government would else be a mockery—a procedure, we may say, that is not permissive but required (§ 3709, Rev. Stats.). By it the Government is given the benefit of the competition of the market and each bidder is given the chance for a bargain. It is a provision, therefore, in the interest of both Government and bidder, necessarily giving rights to both and placing obligations on both. And it is not out of place to say that the Government should be animated by a justice as anxious to consider the bidder as to insist upon its own. And, we repeat, there must be some point at which discretion ceases and obligation takes its place."

Petitioner submits that *a decision of the Comptroller General is not an exercise of administrative discretion.* The administrative discretion of the Air Force reserved to it by 10 U. S. C. A. Section 2305 was exhausted when the Contracting Officer determined to recommend award to Petitioner. This section provides, in part:

> "Awards shall be made . . . to the responsible bidder whose bid conforms to the invitation and will be most advantageous to the United States, price and other factors considered."

This determination of the Contracting Officer amounted to a decision that Petitioner was "responsible" and that its bid "conforms to the invitation" and is "most advantageous to the United States." No significant event occurred between this determination to prevent the award to Petitioner (which would have brought this case directly under the *Purcell Envelope* case) except the decision of the Comptroller General. Therefore, the attempted distinction of the *Purcell Envelope* case made by respondent has no merit and falls.

The Court of Claims in *Heyer Products Co., Inc.* v. *United States*, 135 Ct. Cls. 63 (1956), limited those instances when a bidder for a government contract who did not obtain the contract had rights against the government, to instances where a bid rejection was "fraudulent . . . arbitrary . . . capricious [or] so unreasonable as to necessarily imply bad faith."

We submit that this decision was consistent with Petitioner's position that an otherwise successful bidder, who loses a government contract because of a misinterpretation of law, should be made whole. An action of an administrative official which is arbitrary or capricious amounts to an action which transcends the area of discretion and therefore violates the law.

Respondent urged in the Court below and no doubt will urge here, that since the contract in question was refused to Petitioner on the "merely" erroneous decision of the Comptroller General, the standards of the *Heyer* case have not been met here; by resting its decision upon the *Heyer* case, the Court of Claims apparently agreed with Respondent.

The Comptroller General decided that *as a matter of law* the contract in question could not be awarded to Petitioner. If this decision is erroneous (which must be admitted here, as the Court of Claims did not decide to the contrary) then Petitioner's bid has been arbitrarily rejected. In deciding questions of law there is no area of discretion. A wrong decision on a question of law inflicts a wrong, even though honestly made. While a bidder upon a government contract knowingly assumes the risk that, despite its low bid, it may not receive the contract because of an honest exercise of administrative discretion as to the best advantage to the government, it does not and should not be obliged to accept the loss of a contract solely on account of an unreviewed error of law by an administrative official. Both the *Heyer* and *Purcell Envelope* cases stand for this proposition.

Respondent urged below that since *Armed Services Procurement Regulations Section 2-407.9* required the submission of a protested award to the Comptroller General, the decision of the Comptroller General amounted to an exercise of discretion by the Government. *We point out that matters are submitted to the Comptroller General for determinations of legal questions and not for an exercise of administrative discretion.* Petitioner's legal rights accrued when the Contracting Officer recommended an award to it. The action of the Comptroller General in this case is no different from a case where an erroneous legal decision had been made *after* award and the contract therefore not given to Petitioner. The decision of the Comptroller General is a decision *of law* affecting pre-existing rights.

2. Decisions of the Comptroller General Are Reviewable.

> "The availability of judicial review is the necessary condition, psychologically if not logically, of a system of administrative power which purports to be legitimate, or legally valid.[1] . . ."

This Court has held in *Miguel v. McCarl*, 291 U. S. 442 that an erroneous opinion of the Comptroller General does not affect a duty plainly imposed upon an administrative officer. Having determined that Petitioner's bid was most advantageous to the government, we submit that the Contracting Officer in the instant case had a plain duty to award the contract to Petitioner. Petitioner should not be prejudiced by the Contracting Officer's failure to perform such duty in reliance solely upon an erroneous decision of law of the Comptroller General.

The Administrative Procedure Act specifically provides for judicial review of all determinations by executive officials which are not discretionary decisions.

---

[1] Jaffee, *The Right to Judicial Review I*, 71 Harvard Law Review 401.

It provides at 5 U. S. C. A. 1009:

> "Except so far as (1) statutes preclude judicial review or (2) agency action is by law committed to agency discretion.
>
> (a) Any person suffering legal wrong because of any agency action or adversely affected or aggrieved by such action within the meaning of any relevant statute shall be entitled to judicial review thereof."

Similarly the philosophy of Congress that questions of law determined by executive officials should be subject to judicial review is indicated in the so-called Wunderlich Act (41 U. S. C. 322) providing that

> "no government contract shall contain a provision making final on a question of law the decision of any administrative official, representative or board."

The decision of the Court of Claims violates the foregoing principles of reviewability.

3. It Is to the Benefit of the Government That Bidders on Public Contracts Not Be Prejudiced by Erroneous Determinations of Law.

Perkins v. *Lukens Steel Co.*, 310 U. S. 113 has been cited by Respondent below to the effect that Petitioner was a mere "prospective bidder," and that the public bidding statutes are not for its benefit. It is for the benefit of *the public* that prospective bidders have the assurance that if their's is the best bid in all respects, in the opinion of the contracting officer, they will get the contract. Only thus will the public retain the advantage of receiving honest, spirited and competitive bidding upon supplies and services needed.

Petitioner does not pray in this action for the *benefit* of the contract involved, although in *United States* v. *Purcell Envelope Co.*, supra, the contractor was awarded the difference between the contract price and what performance

of the contract would have cost it. Petitioner here merely asks to be made whole as to its expenses involved in preparing and submitting a bid—which we submit as a matter of law, should have been the successful bid. We urge this Court that the government's reputation for fair dealing owes to bidders on its contracts that, in the face of an error of law as existed here, the aggrieved bidder be put at least in the position he was *before* he began relying on the implication in the invitation for bids that bids would be acted upon free from legal error.

4. The Comptroller General's Decision Was Patently Erroneous.

Although the Court of Claims did not reach the point of deciding whether or not the Comptroller's decision was correct, we believe that this Court should be satisfied that there is merit to Petitioner's claim that it was erroneous.

Paragraph X-2 of the Invitation to Bid (Exhibit 2, transcript) provided:

> "*The bid will not be rejected* if the bidder has previously offered a product which has been previously procured so that additional descriptive literature would not add to the Government's knowledge of the acceptability of the product. The Contracting Officer will verify that the product previously procured id (sic) adequate to meet the requirements of this Invitation for Bids. Upon verification, the requirement for furnishing descriptive literature may be waived as to that bidder."

Thus Petitioner was entitled *not to have its bid rejected* on descriptive literature grounds if the Contracting Officer determined that it had previously supplied a product to the Government within the purport of the above paragraph. The Contracting Officer waived the descriptive literature requirement as to Petitioner based on just such a finding.

Nevertheless, the Comptroller General determined that Petitioner could not be awarded the contract as a matter of law because of a defect in descriptive literature submitted by Petitioner.

CONCLUSION

We submit that it is in the interest of justice, and of upholding the integrity of the United States Government in its business dealings that Petitioner and contractors who may stand in its shoes in the future, not be allowed to suffer on account of an erroneous decision of the Comptroller General. This Court should grant certiorari here in order to clarify to potential bidders on government contracts the area of their rights in the event the exercise of an administrative discretion in their favor is nullified by a subsequent decision erroneous in law.

For the foregoing reasons this petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL W. STEER,
Counsel for Petitioner.

Of Counsel:
STEER, STRAUSS & ADAIR,
2215 Union Central Bldg.,
Cincinnati 2, Ohio.

December —, 1960.

APPENDIX A

10 U. S. C. 2305. Formal advertisements for bids; time; opening; award; rejection

"(a) Whenever formal advertising is required under section 2304 of this title, the advertisement shall be made a sufficient time before the purchase or contract. The specifications and invitations for bids shall permit such free and full competition as is consistent with the procurement of the property and services needed by the agency concerned.

(b) The specifications in invitations for bids must contain the necessary language and attachments, and must be sufficiently descriptive in language and attachments, to permit full and free competition. If the specifications in an invitation for bids do not carry the necessary descriptive language and attachments, or if those attachments are not accessible to all competent and reliable bidders, the invitation is invalid and no award may be made.

(c) Bids shall be opened publicly at the time and place stated in the advertisement. Awards shall be made with reasonable promptness by giving written notice to the responsible bidder whose bid conforms to the invitation and will be the most advantageous to the United States, price and other factors considered. However, all bids may be rejected if the head of the agency determines that rejection is in the public interest.

(d) If the head of the agency considers that any bid received after formal advertising evidences a violation of the antitrust laws, he shall refer the bid to the Attorney General for appropriate action. Aug. 10, 1956, c. 1041, 70A Stat. 130; Sept. 2, 1958, Pub. L. 85-861, § 1 (44), 72 Stat. 1457."

APPENDIX B

Order of the Court of Claims on defendant's motion for summary judgment.

ORDER

This case comes before the court on defendant's motion, filed March 31, 1959, for summary judgment and plaintiff's opposition thereto. Upon consideration thereof, together with oral argument by counsel and based upon *Heyer Products* v. *United States*, 135 Ct. Cl., 63.

IT IS ORDERED this eighteenth day of March, 1960, that defendant's motion for summary judgment be and the same is granted and plaintiff's petition is dismissed.

BY THE COURT

/s/ MARVIN JONES
MARVIN JONES
Chief Judge

FILE COPY

FILED
JAN
JAMES R. BROWNING, CLERK

No. 624

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1960

KELCO INDUSTRIES, INC., A CORPORATION ORGANIZED AND EXISTING UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF OHIO, 2438 BEEKMAN STREET, CINCINNATI 14, OHIO, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

ARCHIBALD COX,
Solicitor General,
GEO. S. LEONARD,
Acting Assistant Attorney General,
JOHN G. LAUGHLIN, JR.,
ROBERT E. POWELL,
Attorneys,
Department of Justice, Washington 25, D.C.

INDEX

	Page
Opinions below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Question presented	2
Statute involved	2
Statement	2
Argument	5
Conclusion	9
Appendix A	10
Appendix B	12

CITATIONS

Cases:	
Heyer Products Co. v. *United States*, 135 C. Cls. 63	8, 9
Perkins v. *Lukens Steel Co.*, 310 U.S. 113	7
United States v. *Purcell Envelope Co.*, 249 U.S. 313	6, 7
Statute:	
10 U.S.C. 2305	2, 7
Miscellaneous:	
Air Force Procurement Instruction, Sec. II, Part 4, ¶ 2–407	7

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1960

No. 624

KECO INDUSTRIES, INC., A CORPORATION ORGANIZED AND EXISTING UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF OHIO, 2438 BEEKMAN STREET, CINCINNATI 14, OHIO, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The United States Court of Claims did not file an opinion. The order of the court, granting respondent's motion for summary judgment and dismissing the petition, is set forth at Pet. App. B, p. 12.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the United States Court of Claims was entered on March 18, 1960. Petitioner, on March 25, May 25, and July 13, 1960, was granted successive extensions of time, totaling 180 days, in which to file a motion for re-hearing or for relief from the judgment or order. Petitioner filed a motion for re-

hearing on September 13, 1960, which was denied on October 5, 1960. The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on January 3, 1961. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1255(1).

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether an unsuccessful bidder on a Government contract has a right to be reimbursed by the United States for expenses incurred incident to the preparation of its bid when the bid was rejected as nonresponsive to the requirements of the invitation to bid.

STATUTE INVOLVED

10 U.S.C. 2305 is set forth at Pet. App. A, p. 11.

STATEMENT

On June 13, 1957, the contracting officer at Gadsden Air Force Base, Alabama, made a joint determination with the Small Business Administration representative to set aside a prospective procurement of MA-7 and MA-8 air conditioners for award to small business concerns (Exhibit 1).[1] Following this determination, the contracting officer issued Invitation for Bids No. 01-608-58-1 on July 25, 1957 (Exhibit 2). On August 8, 1957, a representative of the Wright Air Development Center (Wright) conducted a "Group Builders Conference," which petitioner attended, to discuss the technical aspects of the procurement (Exhibit 3.) Thereafter, on September 26, 1957, petitioner's bid was submitted (Exhibit 2), and,

[1] Exhibits 1–16 have been lodged with the Court in original form. A summary of the contents of each Exhibit is printed in Appendix A, *infra*, pp. 10–11.

along with fourteen other bids, was opened on September 27, 1957, at the Gadsden Base (Exhibit 3–A).

By letter dated October 25, 1957, the Consolidated Diesel Electric Corporation claimed that the bids of the Recony Corporation and petitioner were non-responsive to the requirements of the Invitation for Bids and should be disallowed (Exhibit 4). As a result of this protest, on November 19, 1957, the contracting officer requested Wright to evaluate the descriptive literature submitted by petitioner with its bid (Exhibit 5, p. 1).[2] On December 19, 1957, Wright determined that petitioner's descriptive literature was

---

[2] The provisions of the Invitation for Bids contained, *inter alia:*

> X. DESCRIPTIVE LITERATURE:
>
> 1. All bidders under this Invitation for Bids will be required to submit to the Government the descriptive literature listed below. Such literature shall be submitted with the bids and shall conform in every respect with the requirements of the Invitation for Bids. Sinch [sic] descriptive literature is required for evaluating bids, nonconforming literature shall result in rejection of that bid. The descriptive literature relative to design approaches, etc., which will be required for evaluation purposes is as follows:
>
> * * * * * *
>
> 2. Failure of a bidder to have furnished descriptive literature will result in rejection of that bid. However, the bid will not be rejected if the bidder has previously offered a product which has been previously procured so that additional descriptive literature would not add to the Government's knowledge of the acceptability of the product. The Contracting Officer will verify that the product previously procured id [sic] adequate to meet the requirements of this Invitation for Bids. Upon verification, the requirements for furnishing descriptive literature may be waived as to that bidder.

non-responsive (Exhibit 5, pp. 2–5). Thereafter, on January 8, 1958, the contracting officer advised petitioner (Exhibit 6) that its bid was being rejected as being non-responsive, pursuant to Section X of the Invitation for Bids (footnote 2, *supra*).

The rejection of its bid was immediately protested by petitioner (Exhibit 7 and 8), which asserted that the reasons for the rejection were only minor informalities or irregularities which did not go to the substance of the bid and could be corrected without expense to the Government or prejudice to other bidders. It further noted that it understood that its bid was being forwarded to Headquarters, United States Air Force, for processing to the General Accounting Office (Exhibit 9).

Subsequently, on January 29, 1958, petitioner was advised by letter that the Air Force had decided to waive the requirement pertaining to the submission of descriptive material with its bid, since petitioner had previously supplied air conditioners of a similar, but not identical, type to the Air Force contractors (Exhibit 10). The letter specifically stated that it was written to inform petitioner of the action taken by the Air Force, and was not to be interpreted as a notice of award.

On February 12, 1958, Recony Corporation requested information concerning the waiver of the descriptive-literature requirement so that it could better formulate a protest of the contemplated award of a contract to petitioner (Exhibit 11). On February 25, 1958, petitioner was advised that Recony had protested the waiver, that the matter had been referred

to the Comptroller General for an opinion, and that the making of awards would be held in abeyance pending the Comptroller General's advice (Exhibit 12). On March 31, 1958, the Comptroller General determined that petitioner's bid was not responsive and should be rejected (Exhibit 13). This determination was sustained on May 15, 1958, after review of a request for reconsideration filed by petitioner (Exhibit 14). Thereafter, on June 23, 1958, petitioner protested the making of an award to any other bidder on the ground that the Invitation for Bids was ambiguous (Exhibit 15). Petitioner was advised by the Air Force on June 27, 1958, that its protest was without merit and was notified that the Air Force would proceed to award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder (Exhibit 16).

On September 15, 1958, petitioner filed its petition in the Court of Claims seeking to recover $44,940.00, which it asserted to be the amount it expended in the preparation of its bid and the expenses incident thereto. It further asserted that the action of the Air Force and the Comptroller General had been "unlawful, illegal, erroneous and arbitrary" and that as a result of such action petitioner was denied the right to recoup its expenses. Respondent's motion for summary judgment was granted on March 18, 1960, and the petition was dismissed.

ARGUMENT

By its action in the Court of Claims, petitioner, an unsuccessful bidder for a Government contract, seeks reimbursement from the United States for amounts allegedly expended in preparation of its bid and for

expenses incident to its bid. But an invitation by the United States to bid carries no express or implied obligation that unsuccessful bidders will be reimbursed by the United States for their expense. The order of the Court of Claims (Pet. App. B, p. 12), granting summary judgment for the Government and dismissing the petition, is clearly correct. And since the case raises no questions of general importance, but turns on the particular circumstances, review by this Court is not warranted.

1. Petitioner's reliance (Pet., p. 4) upon *United States* v. *Purcell Envelope Co.*, 249 U.S. 313, is misplaced. The judgment awarded in that case was based upon the breach by the United States of an express contract which came into being when Purcell's low bid was accepted by the entry of a formal order by the Post Office Department, and when Purcell, at the Department's direction, executed and returned a contract to the Department. In contrast to the facts in *Purcell*, petitioner in the present case was notified by the Air Force on February 25, 1958, that, because the Recony Corporation had protested the Air Force decision to waive the descriptive-literature requirement in the Invitation for Bids, the matter was being referred to the Comptroller General for a ruling, and that the award of the contract would be held in abeyance pending the advice of the Comptroller General (Exhibit 12). On March 31, 1958, the Comptroller General advised the Air Force that petitioner's bid was non-responsive to the requirements of the Invi-

tation for Bids and should be rejected (Exhibit 13).[3] The facts in petitioner's case are, then, entirely dissimilar from those in *Purcell* and permit of no argument that administrative discretion in the award of the Air Force contract was exhausted at any point prior to the award of the contract to another bidder following the Comptroller General's decision that petitioner's bid was non-responsive.[4]

2. Petitioner's reliance (Pet., p. 5) upon 10 U.S.C. 2305(c) to support its claim for reimbursement is also without merit. Like other statutory provisions governing Government procurement, that provision is for the benefit of the Government and the public, and does not confer litigable rights or standing to sue upon unsuccessful and disappointed bidders. *Perkins* v. *Lukens Steel Co.*, 310 U.S. 113, 125–127. Moreover, 10 U.S.C. 2305(c) goes no further than to state that contract awards "shall be made with reasonable

[3] The letter of January 29, 1958, from Gadsden Air Force Depot to petitioner (Exhibit 10) informing it of the determination of the contracting officer to waive the descriptive-literature requirement is the only item to which petitioner can point to substantiate its position. That letter, however, antedated the Recony Corporation's protest and specifically stated that it was written only to inform petitioner of the action taken and was in no way to be interpreted as a notice of award.

[4] Following Recony Corporation's protest, the Air Force acted in strict accord with Air Force procurement instructions in submitting the question of the responsiveness of petitioner's bid to the Comptroller General. Air Force Procurement Instruction, Sec. II, Part 4, ¶ 2-407 (Exhibit 17, Appendix B, *infra*, pp. 12–13).

promptness * * * to the responsible bidder *whose bid conforms to the invitation* * * *" (emphasis added). Petitioner's bid was rejected because it did not conform to the descriptive-literature requirement in the Invitation for Bids. Though petitioner contends that this determination was erroneous (Pet., p. 9), the decision was one for the administrative authority to make and was in fact made in strict conformity with applicable procurement instructions of the Air Force (see footnote 4, *supra*, and Appendix B, *infra*, pp. 12–13).

3. Finally, petitioner's reliance (Pet., p. 6) on *Heyer Products Co.* v. *United States*, 135 C. Cls. 63, 71, in which the Court of Claims held that an unsuccessful bidder could recover when there is proof of "a fraudulent inducement for bids * * * with the intent to wilfully, capriciously, and arbitrarily disregard the obligation to let the contract to him whose bid was most advantageous to the Government," is similarly without substance. The decision of the Comptroller General, that petitioner's bid was non-responsive, and the Air Force's rejection of petitioner's bid in accordance with this decision, were neither arbitrary, capricious nor fraudulently motivated. Section X of the Invitation (footnote 2, *supra*) provided alternative methods for submitting descriptive literature. Section X–1 required that descriptive literature listed be submitted with the bid. The section specifically stated that this literature must "conform in every respect" with the requirements of the Invitation, that the literature was "required for evaluating bids," and

that nonconforming literature would result in "rejection of that bid."

Petitioner submitted descriptive literature with its bid. It was evaluated, and was found to be non-responsive (Exhibit 5, pp. 2–5), and petitioner was so notified in detail (Exhibit 6). The evaluation showed that petitioner's product deviated from specifications; that petitioner failed to submit required data, or that the data were incomplete; and that the literature that was submitted contained inaccuracies and design errors (Exhibits 5 and 6). Based on this evaluation, petitioner's bid was rejected (Exhibit 6). In such circumstances, there is nothing in petitioner's case to bring it within the Court of Claims' ruling in *Heyer Products Co.* v. *United States, supra.*

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the petition for a writ of certiorari be denied.

ARCHIBALD COX,
Solicitor General.
GEO. S. LEONARD,
Acting Assistant Attorney General.
JOHN G. LAUGHLIN, JR.,
ROBERT E. POWELL,
Attorneys.

JANUARY 1961.

APPENDIX A

The following are a list and summary of exhibits lodged in this Court in their original form:

Exhibit 1—Joint Set-Aside for Small Business, SBA Form 70, dated 13 June 1957.

Exhibit 2—Invitation for Bids, dated 25 July 1957, and Bid of Keco Industries, Inc., dated 26 September 1957.

Exhibit 3—Report of Group Bidders Conference, 8 August 1957.

Exhibit 3A—Abstract of Bids opened at Gadsden Air Force Base, 27 September 1957.

Exhibit 4—Letter, dated October 25, 1957, from Consolidated Diesel Electric Corporation to Gadsden Air Force Depot.

Exhibit 5—Letter, dated November 19, 1957, from Gadsden Air Force Depot to Wright Air Development Center, and reply thereto, dated December 19, 1957.

Exhibit 6—Letter, dated January 8, 1958, from Gadsden Air Force Depot to Keco Industries, Inc.

Exhibit 7—Telegram, dated January 8, 1958, from Keco Industries, Inc.

Exhibit 8—Letters, dated January 10 and January 17, 1958, from Keco Industries, Inc., to Gadsden Air Force Depot.

Exhibit 9—Telegram, dated January 28, 1958, from Keco Industries, Inc., to Gadsden Air Force Depot.

Exhibit 10—Letter, dated January 29, 1958, from Gadsden Air Force Depot to Keco Industries, Inc.

Exhibit 11—Letter, dated February 12, 1958, from Recony Corporation to Gadsden Air Force Depot.

Exhibit 12—Letter, dated February 25, 1958, from Gadsden Air Force Depot to Keco Industries, Inc.

Exhibit 13—Letter, dated March 31, 1958, from the Comptroller General to the Secretary of the Air Force.

Exhibit 14—Letters, dated May 15, 1958, from the Comptroller General to the Secretary of the Air Force and to Keco Industries, Inc.'s attorneys.

Exhibit 15—Telegram, dated June 23, 1958, from Keco Industries, Inc. to Headquarters, Mobile Air Material Area.

Exhibit 16—Joint Messageform, dated June 27, 1958, from Headquarters, Mobile Air Material Area to Keco Industries, Inc.

APPENDIX B

EXHIBIT 17

AIR FORCE PROCUREMENT INSTRUCTION

Section II. Procurement by Formal Advertising.
Part 4. Opening of Bids and Award of Contracts.
¶2–407. Information to Bidders.

* * * * *

(e) *Notice of Protest Against Award.*

(1) Notice will be given promptly to all bidders affected of any protest or objection against the awarding of a contract to any particular bidder so that, if the interested parties desire, they may take action in their own behalf before further steps are taken in the matter of awarding the contract.

(2) Contracting officers will accept all protests or objections to the award of a contract whether submitted by a bidder or non-bidder. If the protest is submitted orally, the contracting officer will advise the protester that this Instruction requires the protestor [sic] to confirm his protest in writing within such time as the contracting officer may require and that award will be withheld at least until that time has expired. If the written protest is not received within the required time, the oral protest may be disregarded and award made in the normal manner unless the contracting officer, upon investigation, believes that remedial action is required, in which event such action will be taken. If the written protest is received within the required time, the contracting officer will investigate the matter and decide whether the protest is, in his opinion, valid. If

his conclusion is affirmative, he will take necessary action to rectify the erroneous action. If his conclusion is negative, the contracting officer will make a written statement of his opinion in the matter, supported by copies of all pertinent papers. The contracting officer will submit the protest and statement directly to the Director of Procurement and Production, Hq USAF, for *submission to the Comptroller General for decision*, and send a copy to the Commander, AMC, attn: MCPPP, if an AMC field procurement activity or AF local purchase activity is involved. The letter of transmittal should be forwarded by the most expeditious means and marked "IMMEDIATE ATTENTION—PROTEST AGAINST AWARD." The contracting officer will be guided by the decisions of the Comptroller General. Previous Comptroller General decisions on this subject are as follows: 13 Comp. Gen. 315 and 16 Comp. Gen. 497. Submission of protests to the Comptroller General under this paragraph may be dispensed with by the contracting officer if he is satisfied that the protest is without any reasonable degree of foundation or that it was made solely to obstruct and hinder the contracting officer or the otherwise successful bidder. In such case, the contracting officer on his own responsibility, or after asking such advise [sic] as he may desire, may disallow the protest, advising the protester in writing and, if an AMC field procurement activity or AF local purchase activity is involved, forwarding a copy of the correspondence and explanatory remarks to the Commander, AMC, attn: MCPPP [emphasis added].